arXiv:1006.0302v3 [quant-ph] 23 Aug 2010

Reverse test and quantum analogue of classical fidelity and generalized fidelity

Keiji Matsumoto
National Institute of Informatics, 2-1-2, Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
Quantum Computation and Information Project, SORST, JST,
5-28-3, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

August 24, 2010

1 Introduction

In doing hypothesis test in quantum mechanical setting, key part is choice of measurement which maps given pair $\{\rho,\sigma\}$ of quantum states to a pair $\{p,q\}$ of probability distributions. Its inverse operation, or a CPTP map form $\{p,q\}$ to $\{\rho,\sigma\}$ is called *reverse test,* and plays an essential role in characterizing largest monotone quantum analogue of relative entropy [7][8]. In this paper, we exploit the same line of argument in studying quantum analogues of affinity, or classical fidelity $F(p,q)=\sum_x\sqrt{p(x)}\sqrt{q(x)}$, and more *generalized fidelity* $F_f(p,q):=\sum_x p(x)\,f(q(x)/p(x))$, where f is an operator monotone function on $[0,\infty)$. (For example, $f(t)=x^{\alpha}$ $(0<\alpha<1.)$

In the paper, based on reverse test, we define $F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$, which turns out to equal $\mathrm{tr}\,\rho\sqrt{\rho^{-1/2}\sigma\rho^{-1/2}}$. This quantity is monotone increasing by the application of TPCP maps, and in fact is the smallest one among the numbers satisfying these properties, while $F(\rho,\sigma)$ is the largest. It is also proved that $F_{\min}$ satisfies strong joint concavity using reverse test.

For generalized fidelity, we also introduce $F_f^{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ in the similar manner, which turns out to equal $\mathrm{tr}\,\rho f\left(\rho^{-1/2}\sigma\rho^{-1/2}\right)$. Again, this quantity is monotone increasing and is the smallest one among the numbers satisfying these properties. Joint concavity of $F_f^{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ is also proved using reverse test.

It is known that fidelity between infinitesimally different states gives rise to SLD Fisher information metric J^S, or the smallest monotone metric, and that $\cos^{-1}F(\rho,\sigma)$ equals the integral of J^S along the geodesic, or the curve which minimize the integral, connecting ρ and σ.

Correspondingly, $F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ gives rise to RLD Fisher information metric J^R, or the largest monotone metric. However, the integral of RLD Fisher information metric along the geodesic does not equal $\cos^{-1}F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$. In fact, cosine of the integral, denoted by $F_R(\rho,\sigma)$, is another monotone quantum analogue of classical fidelity, and is the smallest one among those which satisfy triangle inequality. On the other hand, $F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ is the integral of RLD Fisher information along the curve which minimize the integral for all the curves with commutative RLD.

An upper and a lower bound of the quantum statistical distance $\Delta(\rho,\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}\|\rho-\sigma\|_1$ using $F(\rho,\sigma)$ is one of notable feature of this quantity. It turns out that $F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ gives analogous bounds of $\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma)$, which is another quantum version of statistical distance $\Delta(p,q) = \frac{1}{2}\|p-q\|_1$, defined using reverse test.

2 Classical fidelity and fidelity

We consider probability distributions over finite set $\mathcal{X}$ with $|\mathcal{X}| = d'$, and quantum states $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ over d-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Define classical and quantum fidelity F by

$$\begin{aligned} F(p,q) &:= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{p(x)}\sqrt{q(x)}, \\ F(\rho,\sigma) &:= \max_{U:\text{unitary}} \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}U \\ &= \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\sqrt{\sigma}\rho\sqrt{\sigma}}. \end{aligned}$$

Known facts about them are :

- $$F(\rho,\sigma) = \min_{M:\text{measurement}} F(M(\rho), M(\sigma)) \tag{1}$$

  where $M(\rho)$ is the probability distribution of measurement M applied to ρ.

- $$F(\rho,\sigma) = \operatorname{tr} W_\rho^\dagger W_\sigma, \tag{2}$$

  where W_ρ and W_σ are $d\times d$ matrices with

  $$\begin{aligned} W_\rho W_\rho^\dagger &= \rho,\ W_\sigma W_\sigma^\dagger = \sigma, \\ W_\rho^\dagger W_\sigma &= W_\sigma^\dagger W_\rho \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

- Given parameterized family $\{p_t\}$ and $\{\rho_t\}$, define *Fisher information* J_t and *symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) Fisher information* J_t^S by

  $$\begin{aligned} J_t &:= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} (l_t(x))^2 p_t(x), \\ J_t^S &:= \operatorname{tr}\left(L_t^S\right)^2 \rho_t, \end{aligned}$$

where l_t, called *logarithmic derivative*, is defined by $l_t(x) := \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\log p_t(x)$, and L_t^S, called *symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD)*, is a solution to a linear equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{1}{2}\left\{L_t^S \rho_t + \rho_t L_t^S\right\}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
F\left(p_t, p_{t+\varepsilon}\right) &= 1 - \frac{1}{8}J_t\varepsilon^2 + o\left(\varepsilon^2\right), \\
F\left(\rho_t, \rho_{t+\varepsilon}\right) &= 1 - \frac{1}{8}J_t^S\varepsilon^2 + o\left(\varepsilon^2\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F(p,q) &= \cos\min_C \frac{1}{2}\int_C \sqrt{J_t}dt, && (3) \\
F(\rho,\sigma) &= \cos\min_C \frac{1}{2}\int_C \sqrt{J_t^S}dt, && (4)
\end{aligned}$$

where minimum is taken for all the paths with $p_0 = p$, $p_1 = q$, and $\rho_0 = \rho$, $\rho_1 = \sigma$, respectively.

- (symmetry)

$$F(\rho,\sigma) = F(\sigma,\rho).$$

- (Monotonicity)

$$F(\rho,\sigma) \leq F(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(\sigma)). \tag{5}$$

- (triangle inequality)

$$\begin{aligned}
\cos^{-1} F(\rho,\sigma) &\leq \cos^{-1} F(\rho,\tau) + \cos^{-1} F(\tau,\sigma), && (6) \\
F(\rho,\sigma) &\geq 2F(\rho,\tau)F(\tau,\sigma) - 1. && (7)
\end{aligned}$$

- (strong joint concavity)

$$F\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\lambda_y\rho_y, \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\mu_y\sigma_y\right) \geq \sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\sqrt{\lambda_y\mu_y}F\left(\rho_y,\sigma_y\right) \tag{8}$$

- (Multiplicativity)

$$F\left(\rho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}\right) = F(\rho,\sigma)^n$$

In the paper, we consider quantities satisfying:

(N) $F^Q(p,q) = F(p,q)$, for all the probability distributions p, q.

(M) $F^Q(\rho,\sigma) \leq F^Q(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(\sigma))$

3 Another quantum analogue of classical fidelity

A triplet $(\Phi, \{p, q\})$ of a CPTP map Φ and probability distributions p, q over the set $\mathcal{X}$ ($|\mathcal{X}| = d'$) with

$$\Phi(p) = \rho, \Phi(q) = \sigma, \tag{9}$$

is called *reverse test* of $\{\rho, \sigma\}$. A reverse test $(\Phi, \{p, q\})$ with (9) is said to be *minimal* satisfying when $|\mathcal{X}| = d = \dim \mathcal{H}$. Define

$$F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma) := \max_{(\Phi, \{p,q\}):(9)} F(p, q). \tag{10}$$

Theorem 1 *Suppose* $F^Q(p, q)$ *(N) and (M). Then,* $F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma) \leq F^Q(\rho, \sigma) \leq F(\rho, \sigma)$*. Also,* $F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$ *satisfies (N) and (M).*

Proof. Let M be a measurement achieving the minimum of (1). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & F^Q(\rho, \sigma) \underset{\text{(M)}}{\leq} F^Q(M(\rho), M(\sigma)) \underset{\text{(N)}}{=} F(M(\rho), M(\sigma)) \\ = \quad & F(\rho, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Let Φ be a CPTP map achieving the maximum of (10). Then

$$\begin{aligned} & F^Q(\rho, \sigma) = F^Q(\Phi(p), \Phi(q)) \underset{\text{(M)}}{\geq} F^Q(p, q) \underset{\text{(N)}}{=} F(p, q) \\ = \quad & F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $F_{\min}(p, q) \geq F(p, q)$. Also, for any p', q' with $p = \Phi(p')$, $q = \Phi(q')$, $F(p', q') \leq F(p, q)$, by (5). Therefore, $F_{\min}(p, q) \leq F(p, q)$, and we have (N).

That $F_{\min}$ satisfies (M) is proved as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\min}(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(\sigma)) &= \max\{F(p, q)\ ; \Phi\text{: CPTP}, \Phi(p) = \Lambda(\rho), \Phi(q) = \Lambda(\sigma)\} \\ &\geq \max\{F(p, q)\ ;\ \Phi = \Phi' \circ \Lambda, \Phi'(p) = \rho, \Phi'(q) = \sigma\} \\ &= \max\{F(p, q)\ ;\ \Phi'(p) = \rho, \Phi'(q) = \sigma\} \\ &= F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

■

Theorem 2 *Suppose* ρ *and* σ *are strictly positive. Then,*

$$F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma) = \operatorname{tr} \rho \sqrt{\rho^{-1/2} \sigma \rho^{-1/2}},$$

and the maximum of (10) is achieved by any minimal reverse test $(\Phi, \{p, q\})$*.*

The proof will be given later.

Remark 3 *Using geometric mean* $A\#B=\sqrt{A}\sqrt{A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}}\sqrt{A}$ *[1],*

$$F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)=\mathrm{tr}\,(\rho\#\sigma)\,. \tag{11}$$

Hence, the well-known property of $\#$

$$\Lambda(\rho)\#\Lambda(\sigma)\geq\Lambda(\rho\#\sigma)$$

immediately implies that $F_{\min}$ *satisfies (M).*

Remark 4 *In [7][8], minimization of* $\mathrm{D}(p||q):=\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}p(x)\ln\frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$ *over all the reverse tests* $(\Phi,\{p,q\})$ *is considered, and it is shown that the minimum is achieved also by any minimal reverse test.*

4 Listing all reverse tests

In this section, to solve maximization (10), we give full characterization of all reverse tests $(\Phi,\{p,q\})$ of $\{\rho,\sigma\}$ with $\Phi(\delta_x)$ being a pure state, where $\delta_{x_0}(x)$ denotes a probability distribution concentrated at $x=x_0$ $(x,x_0\in\mathcal{X})$.

The reason for such a restriction to be made is as follows. If

$$\Phi(\delta_x)=\rho_x=\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}s(y|x)\left|\varphi_{xy}\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_{xy}\right|,$$

let Φ' a CPTP map from probability distributions over $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ such that

$$\Phi'\left(\delta_{(x,y)}\right)=\left|\varphi_{xy}\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_{xy}\right|.$$

Then if $\Phi(p)=\rho$ and $\Phi(q)=\sigma$, $\Phi'(p')=\rho$ and $\Phi'(q')=\sigma$, where

$$p'(x,y)=p(x)\,s(y|x)\,,\ q'(x,y)=q(y)\,s(y|x)\,.$$

Hence, $(\Phi',\{p',q'\})$ is a reverse test of $\{\rho,\sigma\}$ with $\Phi(\delta_x)$ being a pure state, and $p=\Psi_1(p')$, $q=\Psi_1(q')$, where Ψ_1 is taking marginal over $\mathcal{Y}$. Hence, $F(p.q)\geq F(p',q')$. Also, observe $p'=\Psi_2(p)$, $q'=\Psi_2(q)$, where

$$\Psi_2:r(x)\to r(x)\,s(y|x)\,.$$

Therefore, after all,

$$F(p.q)=F(p',q')\,.$$

Therefore, we can replace Φ by Φ'.

Below, we indicate Φ by a matrix N, whose xth column vector is $|\varphi_x\rangle$ with $|\varphi_x\rangle\langle\varphi_x|=\Phi(\delta_x)$. Then the condition (9) is rewritten as

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}p(x)\left|\varphi_x\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_x\right|=\rho,\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}q(x)\left|\varphi_x\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_x\right|=\sigma \tag{12}$$

Here note in general, d' can be larger than $d=\dim\mathcal{H}$.

Lemma 5 *$WW^\dagger = \rho$ if and only if*

$$W = \sqrt{\rho}U,$$

with U being isometry, $UU^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. We only have to show 'only if'. Suppose $WW^\dagger = \rho$. Then, letting $\sqrt{\rho}^{-1}$ be the (Moore-Penrose) generalized inverse of $\sqrt{\rho}$, we have

$$\left(\sqrt{\rho}^{-1}W\right)\left(\sqrt{\rho}^{-1}W\right)^\dagger = P,$$

where P is the projector on the support of ρ. Observe

$$(1-P)\,W\,((1-P)\,W)^\dagger = (1-P)\,\rho\,(1-P) = 0$$

implies

$$(1-P)\,W = 0$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{\rho}^{-1}\left(\sqrt{\rho}^{-1}W\right) = PW = W.$$

Let U' be a partial isometry from $\ker\left(\sqrt{\rho}^{-1}W\right)^\dagger$ to $\ker\rho$,

$$U = \sqrt{\rho}^{-1}W \oplus U'$$

satisfies the requirement. Hence, we have the assertion. ■

In the reminder of the section, we suppose $\rho > 0$. Let D_p and D_q be

$$D_p = \sqrt{\text{diag}\,(p_1, \cdots, p_{d'})},\; D_q = \sqrt{\text{diag}\,(q_1, \cdots, q_{d'})}. \tag{13}$$

Then, by (12), $ND_p\,(ND_p)^\dagger = \rho$ and $ND_q\,(ND_q)^\dagger = \sigma$. Also,

$$T := \sqrt{\rho^{-1/2}\sigma\rho^{-1/2}}\;\; (>0) \tag{14}$$

satisfies $\left(\sqrt{\rho}T\right)\left(\sqrt{\rho}T\right)^\dagger = \sigma$. Therefore,

$$[\sqrt{\rho}\;0]\,V = ND_p,\; [\sqrt{\rho}T\;0]\,U = ND_p, \tag{15}$$

for some U,$V \in \mathrm{U}\,(\mathcal{H}')$, $\dim\mathcal{H}' = d'$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} ND_qD_pN^\dagger &= [\sqrt{\rho}\,T\,0]\,UV^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\rho} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sqrt{\rho}TA\sqrt{\rho} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where, with P being the projector onto $\mathcal{H}$, $A = PUV^\dagger P$. Therefore,

$$TA = A^\dagger T \geq 0. \tag{17}$$

Also, by (15),

$$\begin{aligned}[\sqrt{\rho}\;0]\,V\left(D_p^{-1}D_q\right)V^{\dagger} &= [\sqrt{\rho}T\;\,0]\,UV^{\dagger}\\ &= [\sqrt{\rho}\;0]\begin{bmatrix} TA & TA' \\ A'^{\dagger}T & C \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

where $A' := PU\,(1-P)$ and $C > 0$. If $\dot{C} > 0$ satisfy

$$\ker TA' \subset \ker C,\;\; (TA)^{-1/2}\,(TA')\,C^{-1/2} \leq \mathbf{1}, \tag{18}$$

we have

$$\tilde{T} := \begin{bmatrix} TA & TA' \\ A'^{\dagger}T & C \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \tag{19}$$

Note $\{A; \|A\| \leq 1\}$ is identical to the totality of matrices with the form $A = PUP$, where $U \in \mathrm{U}\,(\mathcal{H}')$, $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}'$, $\dim\mathcal{H}' = d'$ and P is the projector onto $\mathcal{H}$. Then, a reverse test can be composed as indecated in the following (i)-(v):

(i) Choose $A \in \{A; \|A\| \leq 1\}$ with (17).

(ii) Compose A' such that $[A\,A']$ is isometry.

(iii) Let $\tilde{T}$ as of (19), V is diagonalize it :$\tilde{T} = VDV^{\dagger}$.

(vi) Define $|\varphi_x\rangle$ $(x \in \mathcal{X})$ as the normalized column vectors of $[\sqrt{\rho}\,0]V$.

Finally, $p\,(x)$ and $q\,(x)$ is the square of the magnitude of the xth column vector of $[\sqrt{\rho}\,0]V$ and $\left[\sqrt{\rho}TA\,\sqrt{\rho}TA'\right]$, respectively. p and q are obtained also as follows. Define ρ',$\sigma' \in \mathcal{S}\,(\mathcal{H}')$ by

$$\rho' = \begin{bmatrix} \rho & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \sigma' = \tilde{T}\rho\tilde{T},$$

and let the measurement M be projectors onto eigenspaces of $\tilde{T}$. Then, $p = M\,(\rho')$ and $M = (\sigma')$. So, the last step of the composition is:

(v) Let $p = M\,(\rho')$ and $q = M\,(\sigma')$, where M is the projectors onto eigenspaces of $\tilde{T}$.

5 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. of Theorem 2. By (16), ■

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}\,\sqrt{\rho}TA\sqrt{\rho} &= \mathrm{tr}\,ND_qD_pN^{\dagger}\\ &= \mathrm{tr}\,D_qN^{\dagger}ND_p\\ &= \mathrm{tr}\,D_qD_p,\end{aligned}$$

where the last identity is due to $\left(N^\dagger N\right)_{ii}=1$. On the other hand, (17) implies,

$$T^2-(TA)^2=T^2-TAA^\dagger T=T\left(1-AA^\dagger\right)T\geq 0. \tag{20}$$

where the last inequality is due to $\|A\|\leq 1$. Since $\sqrt{t}$ is operator monotone,

$$TA\leq T.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma) &= \max_{p,q:(12)}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\sqrt{p(x)\,q(x)}\\
&= \operatorname{tr} D_q D_p\\
&= \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\rho}TA\sqrt{\rho}\\
&\leq \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\rho}T\sqrt{\rho}\\
&= \operatorname{tr}\rho\sqrt{\rho^{-1/2}\sigma\rho^{-1/2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality is achieved when $A=\mathbf{1}$, which corresponds to minimal reverse tests.

6 Seeing from 'behind'

By Theorem 2 ,,

$$F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)=\operatorname{tr} W_\rho W_\sigma^\dagger,$$

where $W_\rho:=\sqrt{\rho}$ and $W_\sigma:=\sqrt{\rho}T$, with T being as of (14). Observe

$$W_\rho W_\sigma^\dagger=W_\sigma W_\rho^\dagger.$$

Therefore, by (2), we have

$$F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)=F(\rho',\sigma'), \tag{21}$$

where

$$\rho':=W_\rho^\dagger W_\rho=\rho,\ \ \sigma':=W_\sigma^\dagger W_\sigma=T\rho T.$$

A meaning of (21) is given in the sequel. Letting

$$W_\rho=\sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}w_{\rho,i\,x}\left|i\right\rangle\left\langle e_x\right|,\ \ W_\sigma=\sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}w_{\sigma,i\,x}\left|i\right\rangle\left\langle e_x\right|,$$

define

$$\left|W_\rho\right\rangle:=\sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}w_{\rho,i\,x}\left|i\right\rangle\left|e_x\right\rangle,\ \left|W_\sigma\right\rangle:=\sum_{i=1}^d\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}w_{\sigma,i\,x}\left|i\right\rangle\left|e_x\right\rangle.$$

Then, one can easily check

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'} \left|W_\rho\right\rangle \left\langle W_\rho\right| , \ \ \sigma := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'} \left|W_\sigma\right\rangle \left\langle W_\sigma\right| \\ \rho' &= \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left|W_\rho\right\rangle \left\langle W_\rho\right| , \ \ \sigma' = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}} \left|W_\sigma\right\rangle \left\langle W_\sigma\right|\end{aligned}$$

hold. Hence, $F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ equals fidelity of 'hidden' part of the purification of ρ and σ.

7 $F_{\min}$ for pure states

Any reverse test $(\Phi, \{p, q\})$ of $\{\rho, |\varphi\rangle\}$ is in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(\delta_x) &= |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| , \ x \in \mathrm{supp}\, q , \\ \rho &= \Phi(p) = c\, |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| + \sum_{x \notin \mathrm{supp}\, q} p(x)\, \Phi(\delta_x) ,\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $c := \sum_{x\in \mathrm{supp}\, q} p(x)$. Therefore, by monotonicity of Fidelity by CPTP maps,

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \sqrt{p(x)\, q(x)} \leq \sqrt{c\cdot 1} + \sqrt{c \cdot 0} = \sqrt{c},$$

and the inequality is achieved by the following $q(x)$ and $p(x)$:

$$q(x) = \delta_{x_0},\, p(x) = c\delta_{x_0} \ (x \in \mathrm{supp}\, q),$$

where x_0 is a point in $\mathrm{supp}\, q$.

Therefore, we maximize c with $\rho - c\,|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \geq 0$, or equivalently, if $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathrm{supp}\,\rho$,

$$\mathbf{1} - c\rho^{-1/2}\, |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|\, \rho^{-1/2} \geq 0.$$

Therefore, if $|\varphi\rangle \in \mathrm{supp}\,\rho$,

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\min}(\rho, |\varphi\rangle) &= \sqrt{\left(\mathrm{tr}\, \rho^{-1/2}\, |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|\, \rho^{-1/2}\right)^{-1}} \\ &= \left\| \sqrt{\rho}^{-1}\, |\varphi\rangle \right\|^{-1} .\end{aligned}$$

In case $|\varphi\rangle \notin$ supp ρ, the maximum of c with $\rho - c\,|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \geq 0$ is zero, and

$$F_{\min}(\rho, |\varphi\rangle) = 0.$$

In particular,

$$F_{\min}(|\psi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle) = 0. \tag{23}$$

8 Properties of $F_{\min}$

Proposition 6 *$F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$ does not satisfy triangle inequalities: there is ρ, σ, and τ with*

$$\begin{aligned}\cos^{-1} F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma) &> \cos^{-1} F_{\min}(\rho,\tau)+\cos^{-1} F_{\min}(\tau,\sigma),\\ F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma) &< 2F_{\min}(\rho,\tau)\,F_{\min}(\tau,\sigma)-1.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We let

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|,\sigma=|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|,\\ |\psi\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\end{bmatrix},|\varphi\rangle=\begin{bmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\end{bmatrix},\\ \tau &= \frac{1}{\left|\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\right|+\left|\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\right|}\begin{bmatrix}\left|\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\right| & 0\\ 0 & \left|\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\right|\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\min}(|\psi\rangle,|\varphi\rangle) &= 0,\\ F_{\min}(|\psi\rangle,\tau) &= F_{\min}(|\varphi\rangle,\tau)=\frac{1}{\left|\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\right|+\left|\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\right|}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, letting θ be small enough, we have asserted inequalities. (In fact, the inequality is satisfied all θ lying between 0 and $\frac{\pi}{2}$.) ■

Proposition 7 *$F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)=F_{\min}(\sigma,\rho)$, $F_{\min}(\rho^{\otimes n},\sigma^{\otimes n})=F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)^n$.*

Proof. Trivial by definition. ■

Theorem 8 *(Strong concavity)*

$$F_{\min}\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\lambda_y\rho_y,\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\mu_y\sigma_y\right)\geq\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\sqrt{\lambda_y\mu_y}F_{\min}(\rho_y,\sigma_y)$$

Proof. Let $(\Phi_y,\{p_y,q_y\})$ be a reverse test of $\{\rho_y,\sigma_y\}$ with

$$F(p_y,q_y)=F_{\min}(\rho_y,\sigma_y),$$

where p_y, q_y are probability distributions over $\mathcal{X}$ with $|\mathcal{X}|=d'=d$ (minimal). Define $\tilde{p}_{y_0}(x,y):=p_{y_0}(x)\,\delta_{y_0}(y)$, $\tilde{q}_{y_0}(x,y)=q_{y_0}(x)\,\delta_{y_0}(y)$, and $\tilde{\Phi}\left(\delta_{(x,y)}\right):=\Phi_y(\delta_x)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{p}_{y_0}) &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},y\in\mathcal{Y}}p_{y_0}(x)\,\delta_{y_0}(y)\,\Lambda_y(\delta_x)=\rho_{y_0},\\ \tilde{\Phi}(\tilde{q}_{y_0}) &= \sigma_{y_0},\\ F(\tilde{p}_{y_0},\tilde{q}_{y_0}) &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X},y\in\mathcal{Y}}\sqrt{p_{y_0}(x)\,q_{y_0}(x)}\delta_{y_0}(y)\\ &= F(p_{y_0},q_{y_0})=F_{\min}(\rho_{y_0},\sigma_{y_0}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\sqrt{\lambda_y\mu_y}F_{\min}\left(\rho_y,\sigma_y\right)=\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\sqrt{\lambda_y\mu_y}F\left(\tilde{p}_y,\tilde{q}_y\right)\\
\leq\ & F\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\lambda_y\tilde{p}_y,\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\mu_y\tilde{q}_y\right)\leq F_{\min}\left(\tilde{\Phi}\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\lambda_y\tilde{p}_y\right),\tilde{\Phi}\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\mu_y\tilde{q}_y\right)\right)\\
=\ & F_{\min}\left(\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\lambda_y\rho_y,\sum_{y\in\mathcal{Y}}\mu_y\sigma_y\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is due to (8) for classical fidelity, and the third and the fourth line is due to (N) and (M), respectively. ■

Remark 9 *Alternative proof is given using (11) and the following property of # [1]:*

$$A\#C+B\#D\leq\left(A+B\right)\#\left(C+D\right).$$

9 Generalization to F_f

As noted before, both of the minimum of $\mathrm{D}\left(p||q\right)$ and the maximum of $F\left(p,q\right)$ are achieved by minimal ones. This section tries generalization of

Let f be operator monotone function on $[0,\infty)$. Then one can define

$$F_f\left(p,q\right):=\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}p\left(x\right)\,f\left(\frac{q\left(x\right)}{p\left(x\right)}\right).$$

An example is $f\left(t\right)=t^{\alpha}$ $(0<\alpha<1)$,

$$F_{\alpha}\left(p,q\right)=\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}p^{1-\alpha}\left(x\right)q^{\alpha}\left(x\right).$$

Note

$$\mathrm{D}\left(p||q\right)=\lim_{\alpha\to1}\frac{-1}{1-\alpha}\ln F_{1-\alpha}\left(p,q\right).$$

Thus, this family interpolates between $\mathrm{D}\left(p||q\right)$ and $F\left(p,q\right)$.

Their quantum analogue is defined as follows.

$$F_f^{\min}\left(\rho,\sigma\right)=\max F_f\left(p,q\right)$$

here the maximum is taken over all the reverse tests $(\Phi,\{p,q\})$ of $\{\rho,\sigma\}$.

Theorem 10 *If $F_f^Q\left(\rho,\sigma\right)$ satisfies $F_f^Q\left(p,q\right)=F_f\left(p,q\right)$ for all probability distributions p,q, and monotone increasing by any CPTP map,*

$$F_f^{\min}\left(\rho,\sigma\right)\leq F_f^Q\left(\rho,\sigma\right).$$

Proof. Almost parallel with the proof of Theorem 1, thus omitted. ■

Theorem 11

$$F_f^{\min}\left(\lambda\rho_0+(1-\lambda)\rho_1,\lambda\sigma_0+(1-\lambda)\sigma_1\right)\geq\lambda F_f^{\min}\left(\rho_0,\sigma_0\right)+(1-\lambda)F_f^{\min}\left(\rho_1,\sigma_1\right).$$

Proof. Almost parallel with the proof of Theorem 8, thus omitted. ■

Also, we define

$$F'_f(\rho,\sigma):=\mathrm{tr}\,\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\,f\left(T^2\right)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where T is as of 14.

Due to the main result (the equation (3.8)) of [1], one find an operator connection $\natural$ with

$$\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}\,f\left(T^2\right)\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}=\rho\,\natural\,\sigma\quad(\rho>0),$$

thus

$$F'_f(\rho,\sigma)=\mathrm{tr}\,\rho\,\natural\,\sigma\quad(\rho>0).$$

Any operator connection $\natural$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(A\natural B\right)S^\dagger &\leq \left(SAS^\dagger\right)\natural\left(SBS^\dagger\right), \\ A\natural B+C\natural D &\leq (A+C)\,\natural\,(B+D), \end{aligned}$$

(see Theorem 3.5 of [1]) which implies

$$\Lambda\left(A\natural B\right)\leq\Lambda(A)\,\natural\Lambda(B),$$

for any TPCP map Λ. This implies

$$F'_f(\Lambda(\rho),\Lambda(\sigma))\geq F'_f(\rho,\sigma).$$

Since $F'_f(p,q)=F(p,q)$, by Theorem 10,

$$F_f^{\min}(\rho,\sigma)\leq F'_f(\rho,\sigma). \tag{24}$$

Theorem 12 *Suppose* $\rho>0$. *Then,*

$$F_f^{\min}(\rho,\sigma)=F'_f(\rho,\sigma).$$

Moreover, this number is achieved by any minimal reverse test.

Proof. By (24), we only have to show '$\geq$'. Let $(\Phi,\{p,q\})$ be a minimal reverse test. Then, by the argument in Section 4, $p=M(\rho)$ and $q=M(T\rho T)$, where M is the projectors onto the eigenvectors $\{|e_x\rangle\}$ of $T=T=\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\lambda_x\,|e_x\rangle\,\langle e_x|$,

$$p(x)=\langle e_x|\,\rho\,|e_x\rangle\,,\ q(x)=\lambda_x^2\,\langle e_x|\,\rho\,|e_x\rangle\,.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} F_f^{\min}(\rho,\sigma) &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\langle e_x|\,\rho\,|e_x\rangle\,f\left(\lambda_x^2\right) \\ &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\langle e_x|\,\rho f\left(T^2\right)|e_x\rangle=F'_f(\rho,\sigma)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $F_f(\rho,\sigma)\geq F'_f(\rho,\sigma)$, and the proof is complete. ■

10 RLD Fisher information and tangent reverse estimation

Given a parameterized family $\{\rho_t\}$, we define right logarithmic derivative *(RLD) Fisher information* J_t^R by

$$J_t^R := \mathrm{tr}\,\left(L_t^R\right)^{\dagger} L_t^R \rho_t,$$

where L_t^R is called right logarithmic derivative and is the unique solution to the linear equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t} = L_t^R \rho_t.$$

(L_t^R exists if and only if $\mathrm{supp}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t} \subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_t$.)

A triplet $\left(\Lambda, p_t, \frac{\mathrm{d}p_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\right)$ is said to be *tangent reverse estimation* of ρ_t at t if it satisfies

$$\Lambda\left(p_t\right) = \rho_t\,,\ \Lambda\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}p_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\right) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t}.$$

With $\Lambda\left(\delta_x\right) = \left|\varphi_x\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_x\right|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}'} p_t\left(x\right)\left|\varphi_x\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_x\right| &= NP_tN^{\dagger} = \rho_t,\\ \sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}'} \frac{\mathrm{d}p_t\left(x\right)}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\left|\varphi_x\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_x\right| &= N\frac{\mathrm{d}P_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t}N^{\dagger} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\,t},\end{aligned}$$

where $N = \left[\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle, \cdots, \left|\varphi_{d'}\right\rangle\right]$ and $P_t = \mathrm{diag}\,\left(p_t\left(1\right), \cdots, p\left(d'\right)\right)$. When $d' = d = \dim\mathcal{H}$, we say the tangent reverse estimation is *minimal*. It is known that

$$J_t^R = \min J_{p_t},$$

where the minimum is taken for all the tangent reverse estimation of ρ_t at t. It is also known that the minimum is achieved by any minimal tangent reverse estimation, and RLD satisfies

$$L_t^R = NL_tN^{-1} \tag{25}$$

with $L_t = \mathrm{diag}\,\left(l_t\left(1\right), \cdots, l_t\left(d\right)\right)$ and $l_t = \frac{\mathrm{d}p_t/\mathrm{d}\,t}{p_t}$.

11 $F_{\min}$, RLD Fisher information and the shortest distance

Consider a smooth curve $\{\rho_t\}$. Suppose $\{\rho_t\}$ is lying interior of $\mathcal{S}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_{\min}\left(\rho_t, \rho_{t+\varepsilon}\right) \\
= \; & \operatorname{tr} \rho_t \sqrt{\rho_t^{-1/2} \rho_{t+\varepsilon} \rho_t^{-1/2}} \\
= \; & \operatorname{tr} \rho_t \sqrt{\mathbf{1} + \varepsilon \rho_t^{-1/2} \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\, t} \rho_t^{-1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \rho_t^{-1/2} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\, t^2} \rho_t^{-1/2} + O\left(\varepsilon^3\right)} \\
= \; & 1 + \operatorname{tr} \rho_t \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \rho_t^{-1/2} \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\, t} \rho_t^{-1/2} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} \rho_t^{-1/2} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\, t^2} \rho_t^{-1/2} - \frac{1}{8} \left(\varepsilon \rho_t^{-1/2} \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}\, t} \rho_t^{-1/2} \right)^2 \right\} + O\left(\varepsilon^3\right) \\
= \; & 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{8} J_t^R + O\left(\varepsilon^3\right).
\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the $O\left(\varepsilon^3\right)$-term above, we compute $\frac{\mathrm{d}^3}{\mathrm{d}\, s^3} F_{\min}\left(\rho_t, \rho_s\right)$ in the sequel. Abbreviate $X_{t,s} := \rho_t^{-1/2} \rho_{t+s} \rho_t^{-1/2}$ (> 0), and define $A_{t,s}$, $B_{t,s}$, and $C_{t,s}$ by

$$\sqrt{X_{t,s+\varepsilon}} = \sqrt{X_{t,s}} + \varepsilon A_{t,s} + \varepsilon^2 B_{t,s} + \varepsilon^3 C_{t,s} + o\left(\varepsilon^3\right).$$

They are determined by comparing the both ends of

$$X_{t,s} + \frac{\mathrm{d} X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s} \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s^2} \varepsilon^2 + \frac{1}{3!} \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s^3} \varepsilon^3 + o\left(\varepsilon^3\right) = \left\{ \sqrt{X_{t,s}} + \varepsilon A_{t,s} + \varepsilon^2 B_{t,s} + \varepsilon^3 C_{t,s} + o\left(\varepsilon^3\right) \right\}^2,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{t,s} \sqrt{X_{t,s}} + \sqrt{X_{t,s}} A_{t,s} &= \frac{\mathrm{d} X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s}, \\
B_{t,s} \sqrt{X_{t,s}} + \sqrt{X_{t,s}} B_{t,s} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s^2} - \left(A_{t,s}\right)^2, \\
C_{t,s} \sqrt{X_{t,s}} + \sqrt{X_{t,s}} C_{t,s} &= \frac{1}{3!} \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s^3} - \left(A_{t,s} B_{t,s} + B_{t,s} A_{t,s}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sqrt{X_{t,s}} > 0$, the first equation determines $A_{t,s}$ uniquely, and by Theorem VII.2.12 of [2],

$$\sup_{t \le s \le t+\varepsilon} \left\| A_{t,s} \right\| \le \left\| X_{t,s} \right\|^{-1/2} \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d} X_{t,s}}{\mathrm{d}\, s} \right\|.$$

Then the second and third equality determines $B_{t,s}$ and $C_{t,s}$ uniquely, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t \le s \le t+\varepsilon} \left\| B_{t,s} \right\| &\le f_1 \left(\left\| \rho_t \right\|, \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\, s} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\, s^2} \right\| \right), \\
\sup_{t \le s \le t+\varepsilon} \left\| C_{t,s} \right\| &\le f_2 \left(\left\| \rho_t \right\|, \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\, s} \right\|, \left\| \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\, s^2} \right\| \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where f_1, f_2 is a continuous function. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\min}\left(\rho_t,\rho_{t+\varepsilon}\right) &\le \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\sup_{t\le s\le t+\varepsilon}\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}\,s^2}F_{\min}\left(\rho_t,\rho_s\right)\right| \\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\sup_{t\le s\le t+\varepsilon}\left|\mathrm{tr}\,B_{t,s}\rho_t\right| \\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\sup_{t\le s\le t+\varepsilon} f_1\left(\left\|\rho_t\right\|,\left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\,s}\right\|,\left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\,s^2}\right\|\right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|F_{\min}\left(\rho_t,\rho_{t+\varepsilon}\right)-\left(1-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{8}J_t^R\right)\right| &\le \frac{\varepsilon^3}{6}\sup_{t\le s\le t+\varepsilon}\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}^3}{\mathrm{d}\,s^3}F_{\min}\left(\rho_t,\rho_s\right)\right| \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon^3}{6}\sup_{t\le s\le t+\varepsilon}\left|\mathrm{tr}\,C_{t,s}\rho_t\right| \\ &\le \frac{\varepsilon^3}{6}\sup_{t\le s\le t+\varepsilon} f_2\left(\left\|\rho_t\right\|,\left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\,s}\right\|,\left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\,s^2}\right\|\right) \quad (26)\end{aligned}$$

Let us define

$$F_R\left(\rho,\sigma\right) := \cos\left(\min_C\int_C\sqrt{J_t^R}\mathrm{d}\,t\right), \tag{27}$$

where minimization is taken over all the smooth paths connecting ρ and σ. Obviously, $F_R\left(\rho,\sigma\right)$ satisfies (N) and (M), and a triangle inequality (6). Therefore we have:

Proposition 13

$$F_{\min}\left(\rho,\sigma\right)\le F_R\left(\rho,\sigma\right)\le F\left(\rho,\sigma\right),$$

and $F_{\min}\left(\rho,\sigma\right)$ *does not coincide with* $F_R\left(\rho,\sigma\right)$.

Proof. Since $F_R\left(\rho,\sigma\right)$ satisfies (N) and (M), the first assertion is obtained by Theorem 1. Since $F_{\min}$ does not satisfy (6) while $F_R\left(\rho,\sigma\right)$ does, we have the second assertion. ■

Theorem 14

$$F_{\min}\left(\rho,\sigma\right)=\cos\left(\min_C\frac{1}{2}\int_C\sqrt{J_t^R}\mathrm{d}\,t\right), \tag{28}$$

where minimization is taken over all the smooth paths $C=\{\rho_t\}$ *with* $\rho_0=\rho$ *and* $\rho_1=\sigma$, *with* $\left[L_s^R,L_t^R\right]=0$, $0\le\forall s,t\le 1$.

Proof. $\left[L_s^R,L_t^R\right]=0$ and (25) imply $L_t^R=NL_tN^{-1},\forall t$, where L_t is a diagonal real matrix and the column vectors $|\varphi_x\rangle$ ($x=1,\cdots,d'$) of N are normalized. Define $P_0:=N^{-1}\rho_0\left(N^\dagger\right)^{-1}$, then

$$L_0^R\rho_0=NL_0P_0N^\dagger.$$

Therefore, $L_0 P_0$ is Hermitian, and P_0 is also diagonal.

Therefore,

$$\rho_t = N P_t N^{\dagger},\ 0 \leq \forall t \leq 1,$$

where P_t is a real diagonal matrix. Writing the xth diagonal element of P_t as $p_t(x)$, $\sum_{x=1}^{d} p_t(x) = 1$, and thus $p_t(x)$ is a probability distribution over $\{1, \cdots, d\}$. One can check that L_t is the logarithmic derivative of p_t, and that $J_{\rho_t}^{R} = J_{p_t}$. Therefore,

$$\cos\left(\min_{C} \frac{1}{2}\int_{C} \sqrt{J_{\rho_t}^{R}}\mathrm{d}\,t\right) = \cos\left(\min_{C} \frac{1}{2}\int_{C} \sqrt{J_{p_t}}\mathrm{d}\,t\right),$$

where the minimum is taken over all the smooth curves $C = \{p_t\}$ in probability distributions connecting p_0 and p_1. By (3), the LHS equals $\cos^{-1} F(p_0, p_1)$.

Define $\Phi(\delta_x) = |\varphi_x\rangle\langle\varphi_x|$, then $(\Phi, \{p_0, p_1\})$ is a minimal reverse test of $\{\rho, \sigma\}$. Therefore, $\cos^{-1} F(p_0, p_1)$ equals $\cos^{-1} F_{\min}(\rho, \sigma)$, and we have the assertion. ■

Theorem 15 *Suppose that* $F^{Q}(\rho, \sigma)$ *satisfies (M), (N), and*

$$\cos^{-1} F(\rho, \sigma) \leq \cos^{-1} F(\rho, \tau) + \cos^{-1} F(\tau, \sigma).$$

Then,

$$F_R(\rho, \sigma) \leq F^{\cdot Q}(\rho, \sigma) \leq F\ (\rho, \sigma).$$

Proof. We only have to show the lowerbound. Since any bounded and closed subset of interior of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is compact, there is the unique shortest Riemanian geodesic $C = \{\rho_t\}$ with respect to RLD Fisher information metric connecting any $\rho_0 = \rho > 0$ and $\rho_1 = \sigma > 0$ (see Theorem 1.7.1 of [4].) Then, by (6),

$$\begin{aligned}\cos^{-1} F^{Q}(\rho, \sigma) &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon - 1} \cos^{-1} F^{Q}\left(\rho_{k\varepsilon}, \rho_{(k+1)\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon - 1} \cos^{-1} F_{\min}\left(\rho_{k\varepsilon}, \rho_{(k+1)\varepsilon}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where the second line is due to Theorem 1. By elementary calculus, one can verify

$$\cos^{-1} F \leq \sqrt{2(1-F)\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}(1-F)\right)},\ (0 \leq F \leq 1). \tag{29}$$

Due to the smoothness of geodesic, (26), and (29), letting

$$f_{i,t,s} := f_i\left(\|\rho_t\|, \left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\,s}\right\|, \left\|\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\rho_s}{\mathrm{d}\,s^2}\right\|\right),\ (i = 1, 2),$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon-1} \cos^{-1} F_{\min}\left(\rho_{k\varepsilon}, \rho_{(k+1)\varepsilon}\right) \\
\leq \; & \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon-1} \sqrt{2\left(1-F_{\min}\left(\rho_{k\varepsilon}, \rho_{(k+1)\varepsilon}\right)\right)} \sqrt{1+\frac{1}{6}\left(1-F_{\min}\left(\rho_{k\varepsilon}, \rho_{(k+1)\varepsilon}\right)\right)} \\
\leq \; & \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon-1} \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4} J_{k\varepsilon}^R + \frac{1}{3} \sup_{k\varepsilon \leq s \leq (k+1)\varepsilon} f_{1,t,s} \varepsilon^3} \sqrt{1+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{12} \sup_{k\varepsilon \leq s \leq (k+1)\varepsilon} f_{2,t,s}} \\
= \; & \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon-1} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(J_{k\varepsilon}^R\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\left(1+\frac{4}{3} \frac{1}{\left(J_{k\varepsilon}^R\right)^{1/2}} \sup_{k\varepsilon \leq s \leq (k+1)\varepsilon} f_{1,t,s} \varepsilon\right)\left(1+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{12} \sup_{k\varepsilon \leq s \leq (k+1)\varepsilon} f_{2,t,s}\right)} \\
\leq \; & \sum_{k=0}^{1/\varepsilon-1} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left(J_{k\varepsilon}^R\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{1+\varepsilon f_3},
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
f_3 := \sup_{t,s,t',s',u \in [o,1]} \left(1+\frac{4}{3} \frac{1}{\left(J_u^R\right)^{1/2}} f_{1,t,s}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{12} f_{2,t',s'}\right) - 1 < \infty.
$$

Here, taking $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have the assertion. ■

12 Differential equation for shortest paths

In this section, a differential equation satisfied by the geodesic, or the path achieving the minimum in (27) is derived, supposing that ρ_t is an invertible matrix. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{L}\left(\rho_t, \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t}, \lambda_t\right) \quad : & = \int_C \left\{ J_t^R - \lambda_t \left(\operatorname{tr} \rho_t - 1\right) \right\} \mathrm{d}\, t \\
& = \int_C \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^2 \rho_t^{-1} - \lambda_t \left(\operatorname{tr} \rho_t - 1\right) \right\} \mathrm{d}\, t.
\end{aligned}
$$

Taking t proportional to arc length, this is equivalent to finding the extremal of $\int_C \left\{ \sqrt{J_t^R} - \lambda_t \left(\operatorname{tr} \rho_t - 1\right) \right\} \mathrm{d}\, t$ [4]. Then, letting $\{X_t\}$ be an arbitrary smooth curve with $X_0 = X_1 = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\varepsilon}\mathfrak{L}\left(\rho_t + \varepsilon X_t, \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} + \varepsilon\frac{\mathrm{d}X_t}{\mathrm{d}t}, \lambda_t\right)\Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \\
= & \int_C \left[\mathrm{tr}\frac{\mathrm{d}X_t}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) + \mathrm{tr}\, X_t\left\{-L_t^{R\dagger}L_t^R + \lambda_t\right\}\right]\mathrm{d}\,t \\
= & \left[\mathrm{tr}X_t\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right)\right]_{t=0}^1 \\
& + \int_C \mathrm{tr}\, X_t\left\{-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) - L_t^{R\dagger}L_t^R + \lambda_t\right\}\mathrm{d}\,t
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) - L_t^{R\dagger}L_t^R + \lambda_t = 0, \tag{30}$$

where the first identity is by $J_t^R = 1$. In the sequel, the following identity is used frequently.

$$\rho_t L_t^{R\dagger} = \left(L_t^R\rho_t\right)^\dagger = \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^\dagger = L_t^R\rho_t. \tag{31}$$

Multiplying ρ and taking trace of both ends of (30),

$$-\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_t\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) - 1 + \lambda_t = 0,$$

where we used $J_t^R = 1$, (31), and $\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_t L_t^R = \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_t L_t^{R\dagger} = \mathrm{tr}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = 0$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_t\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) &= \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_t\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) - \mathrm{tr}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) \\
&= -\mathrm{tr}\,\left(\rho_t L_t^{R\dagger}L_t^R + L_t^R\rho_t L_t^{R\dagger}\right) = -2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\lambda_t = -1$, and we obtain

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(L_t^R + L_t^{R\dagger}\right) + L_t^{R\dagger}L_t^R + 1 = 0, \tag{32}$$

which gives only determines time derivative of only Hermitian part of L_t^R. Obviously, we need another equation. By (31), we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t}L_t^{R\dagger} + \rho_t\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^{R\dagger}}{\mathrm{d}t} = L_t^R\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} + \frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^R}{\mathrm{d}t}\rho_t.$$

Observing

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t}L_t^{R\dagger} = L_t^R\rho_t L_t^{R\dagger} = L_t^R\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t},$$

we obtain

$$\rho_t\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^{R\dagger}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^R}{\mathrm{d}t}\rho_t,$$

and

$$\rho_t \frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^R}{\mathrm{d}t} + \frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^R}{\mathrm{d}t}\rho_t + \rho_t L_t^{R\dagger} L_t^R + \rho_t = 0. \tag{33}$$

(33) and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = L_t^R \rho_t \,,$$

determine time evolution of ρ_t.

The differential equation satisfied by the curve achieving minimum in (3) is derived by applying these to commutative case,

$$2\frac{\mathrm{d}l_t}{\mathrm{d}t} + (l_t)^2 + 1 = 0,\ \frac{\mathrm{d}p_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = l_t\, p_t. \tag{34}$$

From these, the differential equation for the curve achieving minimum in (28) is derived as follows. Along the curve, we should have

$$L_t^R = N L_t N^{-1},\ \rho_t = N\left(D_t\right)^2 N^\dagger,$$

where $(D_t)^2 = \mathrm{diag}\ (p_t(1), \cdots p_t(d))$, $L_t = \mathrm{diag}\ (l_t(1), \cdots l_t(d))$. Since $F_{\min}(\rho_0, \rho_1) = F(p_0, p_1)$, (p_t, l_t) should satisfy (34). Therefore, dynamics of (ρ_t, L_t^R) is determined by

$$2\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t^R}{\mathrm{d}t} + \left(L_t^R\right)^2 + 1 = 0,\ \frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_t}{\mathrm{d}t} = L_t^R \rho_t \,. \tag{35}$$

13 Another quantum analogy of statistical distance

Statistical distance $\Delta(p,q)$ is defined by

$$\Delta(p,q) := \frac{1}{2}\left\|p-q\right\|_1 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\left|p(x)-q(x)\right|.$$

Its frequently used quantum analogy is

$$\Delta(\rho,\sigma) := \frac{1}{2}\left\|\rho-\sigma\right\|_1,$$

and also called statistical distance. Known facts about them are [3][5][6][9][11]:

- $$\Delta(\rho,\sigma) = \max_{M:\text{measurement}} \Delta\left(M(\rho), M(\sigma)\right).$$
- (Monotonicity by CPTP maps) If Λ is a CPTP map,
  $$\Delta\left(\Lambda(\rho), \Lambda(\sigma)\right) \le \Delta(\rho,\sigma)$$
- (Joint convexity)
  $$\Delta\left(\lambda\rho_0 + (1-\lambda)\rho_1, \lambda\sigma_0 + (1-\lambda)\sigma_1\right) \le \lambda\Delta(\rho_0,\sigma_0) + (1-\lambda)\Delta(\rho_1,\sigma_1)$$

- (Triangle inequality)

$$\Delta(\rho,\sigma) \leq \Delta(\rho,\tau) + \Delta(\tau,\sigma)$$

- With $\mathrm{D}(\rho||\sigma) := \mathrm{tr}\,\rho(\ln\rho - \ln\sigma)$ being relative entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - F(\rho,\sigma) &\leq \Delta(\rho,\sigma) \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho,\sigma)^2}, \qquad (36)\\ \mathrm{D}(\rho||\sigma) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\Delta(\rho,\sigma)^2. \qquad (37) \end{aligned}$$

Here we introduce a new quantum analogue of statistical distance is:

$$\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) := \min_{(\Phi,\{p,q\}):\text{reverse test of }\{\rho,\sigma\}} \Delta(p,q).$$

Theorem 16 *Suppose* $\Delta^Q(\rho,\sigma)$ *satisfies monotonicity by CPTP maps and* $\Delta^Q(p,q) = \Delta(p,q)$ *for any probability distributions* p, q. *Then*

$$\Delta(\rho,\sigma) \leq \Delta^Q(\rho,\sigma) \leq \Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma).$$

Also, $\Delta_{\max}$ *is monotone by CPTP maps and* $\Delta_{\min}(p,q) = \Delta(p,q)$.

Proof. Almost parallel with the proof of Theorem 1, thus omitted. ■

Theorem 17 *Defining* $\mathrm{D}^R(\rho||\sigma) := \mathrm{tr}\,\rho\ln\sqrt{\rho}\sigma^{-1}\sqrt{\rho}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\max}(\lambda\rho_0 + (1-\lambda)\rho_1, \lambda\sigma_0 + (1-\lambda)\sigma_1) &\leq \lambda\Delta_{\max}(\rho_0,\sigma_0) + (1-\lambda)\Delta_{\max}(\rho_1,\sigma_1), \qquad (38)\\ 1 - F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma) &\leq \Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) \leq \sqrt{1 - F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)^2}, \qquad (39)\\ \mathrm{D}^R(\rho||\sigma) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma)^2. \qquad (40) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of (38) is almost parallel with the one of Theorem 8, thus omitted. To prove the first inequality of (39), consider the optimal reverse test with $\Delta(p,q) = \Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma)$. Then, by (36), we have

$$\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) = \Delta(p,q) \geq 1 - F(p,q),$$

On the other hand, by definition of $F_{\min}$, $1 - F(p,q) \geq 1 - F_{\max}(\rho,\sigma)$. After all, we have $\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) \geq 1 - F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)$. The second inequality of (39) and (40) are proved almost parallelly,recalling the following characterization of $\mathrm{D}^R(\rho||\sigma)$ (Theorem 2.4 in [8]):

$$\mathrm{D}^R(\rho||\sigma) = \min \mathrm{D}(p||q),$$

where minimum is taken over all the reverse test $(\Phi,\{p,q\})$ of $\{\rho,\sigma\}$. ■

It follows from (39) and (23) that

$$\Delta_{\max}(|\varphi\rangle, |\psi\rangle) = 1,$$

for all $|\varphi\rangle$,$|\psi\rangle$. Another consequence of (39) is:

Proposition 18 *The triangle inequality for* $\Delta_{\max}$ *does not hold, i.e., there is* ρ*,* σ*, and* τ *with*

$$\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) > \Delta_{\max}(\rho,\tau) + \Delta_{\max}(\tau,\sigma).$$

Proof. Let ρ and σ be as of the proof of Proposition 6. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) &= 1, \\
\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\tau) + \Delta_{\max}(\tau,\sigma) &\leq \sqrt{1 - F_{\min}(\rho,\tau)^2} + \sqrt{1 - F_{\min}(\tau,\sigma)^2} \\
&= 2\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\left(\left|\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\right| + \left|\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\right|\right)^2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, making θ close enough to 0, we have the assertion. ■

In general, $\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma)$ is hard to compute. But when $\sigma = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$, one can compute the number as follows. Any reverse test $(\Phi, \{p, q\})$ of $\{\rho, |\varphi\rangle\}$ is in the form of (22). Then, with $c := \sum_{x\in\operatorname{supp} q} p(x)$,

$$\|p-q\|_1 \geq \frac{1}{2}|c-1| + \frac{1}{2}|(1-c)-0| = 1-c,$$

where the inequality is due to monotonicity of $\|\cdot\|_1$, and is achieved by $p(x) = cq(x)(\ x \in \operatorname{supp} q\ )$. Therefore, to minimize $\|p-q\|_1$, one has to maximize c, which can be any positive number satisfying $\rho - c|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| \geq 0$, or equivalently,

$$1 - c\rho^{-1/2}|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|\rho^{-1/2} \geq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\Delta_{\max}(\rho, |\varphi\rangle) = 1 - \frac{1}{\left\|\rho^{-1/2}|\varphi\rangle\right\|^2} = 1 - F(\rho, |\varphi\rangle)^2.$$

Also, by the argument in Section , we have the following upperbound to $\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma)$:

$$\Delta_{\max}(\rho,\sigma) \leq \Delta(M(\rho), M(T\rho T)) \leq \Delta(\rho, T\rho T),$$

where T is as of (14), and M is the projectors onto eigenspaces of T. (Note the left most end is upperbounded by

$$\sqrt{1 - F(\rho, T\rho T)^2} = \sqrt{1 - F_{\min}(\rho,\sigma)^2},$$

and gives a better bound than (39).)

14 Discussions

$F_f^{\min}$ introduced in this paper resembles g-quasi relative entropy [10]

$$S_g(\rho,\sigma) := \operatorname{tr}\rho^{1/2} g\left(L_\sigma R_\rho^{-1}\right)\left(\rho^{1/2}\right),$$

where g is operator convex function (thus, $-g$ is operator monotone) on $[0,\infty)$, and

$$L_\sigma(A) = \sigma A,\ R_\rho(A) = A\rho.$$

For example, with $g = 1 - x^{1/2}$, it gives rise to $S_\alpha(\rho,\sigma) := 1 - \mathrm{tr}\,\rho^{1-\alpha}\sigma^\alpha$. This quantity satisfies

$$S_\alpha(\rho,\sigma) \geq 1 - F_\alpha^{\min}(\rho,\sigma),$$

where

$$F_\alpha^{\min}(\rho,\sigma) := \mathrm{tr}\,\rho^{1/2}T^{2(1-\alpha)}\rho^{1/2} = \mathrm{tr}\,\rho^{1/2}\left(\rho^{-1/2}\sigma\rho^{-1/2}\right)^{1-\alpha}\rho^{1/2},$$

and the equality does not hold in general.

It is interesting that both of the maximum of $F_f(p,q)$ are achieved by minimal reverse tests. Some numerics suggests that this is not the case for the minimum of $\Delta(p,q)$.

An open question is weather F_R satisfies strong joint convexity or not. Also, ,more explicit formula for F_R and $\Delta_{\max}$ would be, even for some special cases, of importance.

References

[1] F. Kubo and T. Ando, “Means of positive linear operators,” Mathematische Annalen, vol. 246, pp. 205–224 (1980).

[2] R. Bhatia, ”Matrix Analysis”, Springer-Verlag (1996).

[3] C. A. Fuchs, ”Distinguishability and Accessible Information in Quantum Theory”, Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico (1996).

[4] Jurgen Jost,” Riemannian Geometry and Geometric Analysis” Fifth Edition, Springer-Verlag (2008).

[5] K. Matsumoto, A Geometry of Quantum States, Master Thesis, University of Tokyo, Master’s thesis (1995).

[6] K. Matsumoto, A Geometrical Approach to Quantum Estimation Theory, Doctoral dissertation, University of Tokyo (1998).

[7] K. Matsumoto, ”Reverse Estimation Theory, Complementality between RLD and SLD, and Monotone Distances”, http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/quant-ph/0511170.

[8] K. Matsumoto, ”Reverse test and Characterization of Quantum Relative Entropy”, http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/1006.0302

[9] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, ”Quantum Computation and Quantum Information”, Cambridge University Press (2000).

[10] D. Petz, "Quasi-Entropies for Finite Quantum Systems", Reports on Mathematical Physics, 23, 57 (1986)

[11] A. Uhlmann, “Density operators as an arena for differential geometry,” Rep. Math. Phys., vol.33, pp.253-263(1993).